

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 21, 2008. A Request for a Three Month Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is submitted herewith, along with the fee prescribed by 37 CFR 1.17(a)(iii). The response is therefore timely.

Claims 1, 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48 and 57 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 7, 10, 15, 24-25, 27-28, 31-32, 43, 47-48 and 57 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0054990) in view of Gransden (European Patent Application Publication 0106574), and in further view of Grabert (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0085867). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nakamura discloses an image display system that comprises a projector, a screen, and correcting means. Nakamura's image display system features a particular way of providing feedback for providing corrected video signals to each of a plurality of single color projection units. Essentially, however, Nakamura discloses what a layperson usually associates with a "projector".

Thus, Nakamura is not really a promising starting point for a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the present invention. The Examiner points to figure 6A to argue that Nakamura's projector has the feature of "projecting a light pattern comprising one or more illuminated areas from a projector onto a screen". This may be true. However, as also pointed out by the Examiner, Nakamura does not disclose that the projector projects a message or announcement. Nor does Nakamura disclose that the outlines of the illuminated areas correspond to outlines of the screen.

Gransden discloses a sign that has a construction of plates having significant structural rigidity. Cut-outs are formed in these plates, and an acrylic material is mounted in the cut-outs. A light source illuminates the acrylic material. The invention can provide an illuminated logo. However, there is no reason why a person of ordinary skill should attempt to combine Nakamura and Gransden's disclosures. Furthermore, the two cannot be combined to yield the present invention. Gransden does not use a projector, and there is no reason why one should introduce a

projector into the Gransden sign. Considering that Gransden desires that his sign be kept simple (page 3, lines 4-9), it seems neither necessary nor desirable to introduce a projector as a light source, which would only add both complexity and cost. Thus, using a projector within Gransden's sign is not a realistic substitution or improvement. Nakamura also does not motivate a combination of his projector with a sign like Gransden's.

With respect to the Grabert reference, it is not clear why a person of ordinary skill in the art would single out Grabert's disclosure in view of Nakamura and/or Gransden. More importantly, though, the disclosures of Nakamura, Gransden, and Grabert cannot be combined to yield the present invention. None of them discloses or suggests that the illuminated areas correspond to the outlines of the screen. Grabert perhaps discusses projection of a light pattern on a windshield (paragraph [0124]), but he does not disclose that the outline of the projected images should fit the windshield (screen). A heads-up display (paragraph [0108], Fig. 18), for instance, must cover only a part of a windshield, or it will obstruct the driver's view. It is further noted in this respect that the example in Fig. 18 is a front-projection setup, and there is no cut-out involved.

It is also noted that in connection with a heads-up display, proxels are adapted in a specific fashion (Figures 5B and 5C). The present invention can use an off-the-shelf projector. Applicant also notes that Nakamura considers the heads-up display an "exotic application" (paragraph [0069]). These are not encouraging teachings to motivate an attempt to improve Gransden's sign.

The latter point leads to the question of what would motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nakamura, Gransden and Grabert, given that no reasonable combination of the cited references would provide the present invention. Applicant respectfully further submits that the very attempt to combine them would suggest itself only by the use of hindsight by someone having knowledge of the solution provided by the present invention. Thus, for example, Applicant respectfully suggests that replacing a light source in a sign having a cut-out with a projector displaying video images, based on a methodology of a third party who uses neither cut-outs nor video images, cannot be considered obvious (even if the three disclosures could be combined to produce the present invention, which Applicant denies).

Applicant therefore respectfully maintains that independent claims 1 and 24, and dependent claims 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, and 57 define patentably over the art of record, and should be allowed.

Request for Non-Final Second Office Action

Since it is the Applicant's contention that the application is now in condition for allowance, it is anticipated that a Notice of Allowance will be issued in due course. Should the Examiner again reject the application and assert new grounds for the rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to present any such rejection in a Non-Final Office Action, as required by MPEP 706.07(a).


Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 8, 12, 33, 34, and 37 have been amended to provide better clarity and to assure compliance with 35 USC §112 by, for example, assuring compliance with the requirement of providing an antecedent basis for each claim term. Neither the meaning nor the scope of any claim is intended to be changed, nor is it Applicant's belief that any change in the meaning or scope of any claim has thus been introduced.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 7-12, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, and 57 are patentable over the art of record and should therefore be allowed. Passage of the application to issue is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 18, 2009


HOWARD J. KLEIN
Registration No. 28,727

Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP (Customer No.: 22145)
43 Corporate Park, Suite 204
Irvine, CA 92606
Tel: (949) 955-1920
Fax: (949) 955 1921
Attorney Docket No. 578-20-PA